Application No. 10/687,288

Amendment filed: February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7 and 10-14 under 35 USC 102(b) as unpatentable over Takemura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,759,739). The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-7, 10 and 15 under 35 USC 102(b) as unpatentable over Cathey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,358,599). The Examiner has rejected claims 8-9, 16-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Cathey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,358,599), in view of Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0204328). The Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach all of the elements of the Applicants' claimed invention. In particular, the cited references fail to teach the element of independent claim 1 and independent claim 10 of "a non-chemically amplified photoresist". A non-chemically amplified photoresist is one where the resin is soluble in a developer solution and become more soluble in the developer once the photoresist resin is exposed to light or some other type of radiation. In contrast, <u>Takemura</u> teaches a chemically amplified photoresist which is a photoresist that includes a photo-acid generator (see abstract.) The resin within a chemically amplified resist is NOT soluble in a developer. The solubility of the resin is changed to be soluble in a developer solution once compounds within the resin are deprotected by a photo-generated acid that is created by exposing the photo-acid generator to light or radiation. Cathey also fails to teach a non-chemically amplified resist and instead teaches a chemically amplified photoresist that "typically comprises an acidcatalyzed photosensitive resin." Zhang also fails to teach the elements of the independent claims. Therefore, the Applicants' respectfully submit independent claims 1 and 10 and the claims that depend upon and incorporate the limitations of these claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references. Claims 16 – 20 have been cancelled.

Application No. 10/687,288

Amendment filed: February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 (a)

Applicant respectfully petitions pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) for a two month extension of time to file this response to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2005. The extended period is set to expire on February 21, 2006. A check in the amount of \$450.00 is enclosed to cover the fee for a two month extension of time.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: $\frac{2}{2}$, 2006

Heather M. Molleur Reg. No. 50,432

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 (408) 720-8300